Approved For Release 2005/06/09 : CIA-RDP80B01495R000600190001-8

SECRET

DDI-340-73

26 MAR 1973

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Secretary
CIA Management Committee

SUBJECT : IG Survey of OER

1. I have reviewed the IG Survey of OER and am, quite naturally, very pleased by such a favorable report. The Survey team did a very thorough job in reviewing OER's operations. Their report is lucid, well written and shows a good understanding of what OER is all about and how it operates. The Survey's recommendations--both formal and informal--are well taken and focus on issues about which both the Director, OER, and I are aware and are taking corrective action. Before commenting on the Survey's formal recommendations, I would like to make some general comments on points raised by the IG team.

2. The IG Survey quite rightly made a strong point of the poor physical working conditions in OER. The crowding of analysts and the paucity of working space are regrettable and have a perverse effect on morale and the efficiency of operations. As you well know, this regrettable condition is not unique to OER and the space problem remains a constant irritant among our employees. In my initial sessions with Mr. Schlesinger, I identified the space situation as one of our principal problems. As soon as the IG Survey on space is completed, I would hope that it will become a top priority matter for the Management Committee to consider and to take effective action upon.

3. The review process in OER was also a problem on which the IG Survey team focused. I agree that the review process had been overly encumbered by unnecessary review layers and, as such, a subject of legitimate complaint by the

25X1

SECRET

Approved For Release 2005/06/09 : CIA-RDP80B01495R000600190001-8

analysts. I do not believe that the review process has had a double standard. The high priority project obviously passes through the system much more quickly. This is not only because of externally imposed deadlines, but also because the analysts assigned to such projects are our most responsive, substantively skilled and able writers. Given the rapid pace of OER daily activities, I cannot subscribe to the view that routine papers are being over-edited or over-reviewed simply because the reviewer has time on his hands. I would suspect that the amount of review and editing required for a given report is proportionate to the extent to which the draft is deficient in research or analysis.

4. In any event I believe that recent measures will eliminate most of the analysts' complaints about the review process. OER's recent reorganization has reduced the number of organizational levels through which a draft must pass. In addition, the Director, OER, has recently initiated a new system of monthly and quarterly planning of OER production designed to ensure, among other things, that both analyst and supervisor understand and agree on the purpose and scope of each project. These procedures have already reduced markedly the number of projects that have to be substantially redone during the later stages of the review process.

5. Furthermore, in response to the DCI's instruction to reduce the number of publications, I have recently formulated new guidelines for the production of finished intelligence in the Intelligence Directorate. These guidelines will mean that a substantial part of OER production will be produced in typescript form and disseminated upon request only. Such projects obviously will require far less editing and review than those projects which must meet the higher standards required for official Agency publications. By carefully delineating the types of projects that will not be published and by tailoring our product to specific audiences and consumers, it is clear to me that it would not be practical to adopt a basic and uniform review standard, as suggested in the Survey.

Approved For Release 2005/06/09 : CIA-RDP80B01495R000600190001-8

6. I have the following comments on the two recommendations made by the IG Survey team:

Recommendation No. 1

> "That the Director, Office of Economic Research give further study to the policy of assignment of analysts to less active accounts, not only in terms of the numbers so assigned but in the assignment of research projects outside the area of their primary responsibility, in order to keep them gainfully employed."

Comment

This recommendation has merit and is, in fact, one that the Director, OER, has tried to implement wherever he could. Analysts in low-priority areas obviously have fewer opportunities to get into the mainstream of current intelligence and IM production. Under my new guidelines, these opportunities will, perforce, be even more limited. Nevertheless, there are still considerable opportunities for the innovative analyst to produce self-initiated research that is useful at the policy making levels of Government. Even though this work will not always be published, our new production guidelines still provide outlets for unpublished finished intelligence. The new guidelines will also bring about part of the IG recommendation by reducing the number of analysts assigned to lower priority topics or countries. This will enable us to assign more analysts to higher priority assignments. I also expect the Director, OER, to ensure that analysts will not be assigned to lower priority areas on a permanent basis, but will be allowed to move into other areas. The Director, OER, will also continue his practice of giving analysts on lower priority areas the opportunity to work on projects involving broad questions of economic development.

Recommendation No. 2

> "That the Director, Office of Economic Research, develop a trial program for eliciting reactions and evaluations of selected consumers of selected papers,

Approved For Release 2005/06/09 : CIA-RDP80B01495R000600190001-8

SECRET
Approved For Release 2005/06/09 : CIA-RDP80B01495R000600190001-8

in order to determine the degree to which they are satisfied with present approaches to preparation of reports, as a basis for modifying present practice if so indicated."

Comment

This recommendation touches on a problem which is pertinent to the entire array of DDI production. It is an integral part of the Agency's approach to "management by objective" and the means by which we can measure the achievement of our objectives. We are in the process of trying to devise a meaningful method of evaluating our product. Such evaluation is particularly difficult in an area where quantitative measurements are desired for output that must be measured essentially in qualitative terms.

Informal systems of feedback from our customers have so far not been reliable means of evaluating OER's, or any other office's product. Customer responses become largely pro forma or the customer is reluctant to give a negative response for fear that the tap will be turned off. OER has tried to cope with this situation by mounting a major effort to determine our customers' needs and, in concert with the customer, to decide on the best production vehicle to meet these needs. Our new production guidelines have chosen the Intelligence Brief, a highly personalized and tailored document, as a means of being most responsive to the policy makers' needs.

OER has also set up a wide network of contacts with staff officers in the NSC, Treasury, the CIEP and the entire economic community. Key OER personnel have been designated as the principal contact points for specified policy level customers and their immediate staff officers. I am hopeful that as these contacts become more frequent that we will have considerable success in eliciting informed reactions to and evaluations of the OER product.

25X1

EDWARD W. PROCTOR
Deputy Director for Intelligence

cc: Inspector General

ADDI/PVWalsh/tb (26 Mar 73)

Distribution:

Orig & 1 - Addressee
1 - IG
1 - D/OER
1 - DDI (File: IG Survey of OER)
1 - DDI Chrono
1 - DDI Admin.
1 - DDI

Approved For Release 2005/06/09 : CIA-RDP80B01495R000600190001-8
SECRET

25X1